

Nationalism Gains in Europe

Yugoslavia's Readiness to Meet Attack
Stirs Satellites' Opposition to Soviet

Growing evidence that the Titoist movement is taking strong hold in Europe—both behind and outside the Iron Curtain—is causing some recalculation of war-potential factors among the Western powers—as it must be doing in Moscow.

Yugoslavia's determination to defend itself against attack either by the Soviet Union or its satellites and growing evidence that the United States—although uncommitted to do so—would leap to Yugoslavia's defense if necessary are certainly deterrents to any rash act by Moscow.

The undermining of the Soviet's tight hold on the Eastern European satellites—as evidenced by nationalist deviation in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland—and the division of the Communist parties of Italy and Western Germany into pro-Moscow and anti-Moscow factions may become powerful deterrents to any Russian effort to take over Western Europe at any time in the near future. And as time goes on the chances of reviving nationalism expressing itself plainly in the satellites becomes greater.

One factor which has worked to keep the satellites under the thumb of Moscow has been almost complete isolation in 1945 of the peoples who suffered under Nazi occupation during the war. Moral and political devastation—to say nothing of such vast physical devastation as was visited on Yugoslavia—

was so great that the people of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria were left dazed. Many of them are still too dazed from their frightful experiences to have even the desire to do anything about their present situation.

All of them, however, have strong nationalistic traditions which in the long run make them poor material for any long-range Russian plan of suppression and exploitation. Hungary was an independent nation for centuries before it fell under Hapsburg rule. It succeeded in forcing the Hapsburg monarchs to give it, in 1867, a status almost equal to that of Austria.

Both the Poles and Czechs also evinced nationalist deviation in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland—and the division of the Communist parties of Italy and Western Germany into pro-Moscow and anti-Moscow factions may become powerful deterrents to any Russian effort to take over Western Europe at any time in the near future. And as time goes on the chances of reviving nationalism expressing itself plainly in the satellites becomes greater.

The Bulgarians, likewise, threw off Ottoman rule and jealously guarded their independence in the latter part of the 19th century and first 40 years of the 20th century, until they were taken under the domination of Hitlerite Germany. This was succeeded by the assertion of the present tight Soviet control.

If the Russians are not already aware that reviving nationalism makes these peoples

unreliable supports for any campaign of conquest in Western Europe, they are likely before long to be made aware of that fact. The Moscow reaction to accumulating evidence of nationalist deviation in the satellites will show whether the chances for peace are weakened or strengthened by internal dissension within the Soviet bloc.

Russia may become convinced that it is fighting a losing battle to hitch its small neighbors firmly to its own wagon and may accept resurgent nationalism in those countries as preferable to a more serious break which would throw the present-day satellites into the arms of the Western democracies. This would be Moscow's reaction if its purposes in Europe were peaceful and it did not expect to have to lean heavily on the satellites for manpower and industrial and agricultural production.

If, however, Russia's intentions in Europe are to dominate all the Western part of the continent—and there seems no reason at this date to believe that Soviet intentions are otherwise—it will tighten rather than relax its hold on the puppet states. It will purge ruthlessly all those nationalist elements which raise their heads, and will go as far as necessary—as witnessed already in Poland—to prevent any of the peoples now behind the Iron Curtain from following Marshal Tito's example.

Rail Union Proposes

Douglas, Morse for Presidential Race

By the Associated Press

A rail union publication has proposed Senators Morse, Republican of Oregon, and Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, as possible 1952 presidential standard-bearers for the two major political parties.

In an editorial entitled "Wake Up, Labor," the Trainmen's News, official organ of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, criticized President Truman for his recent crack about the four-rail union leaders acting like a bunch of Russians. It added:

"We are suggesting that labor make its plans now for 1952. Some consideration should be given to Senator Wayne Morse as a Republican standard-bearer and Senator Paul Douglas as a Democratic standard-bearer."

Both are courageous, honest liberals, who, regardless of the complexion of Congress, simply are incapable of leading the country into a mess like today's, but would surely lead us out of it."

The editorial also declared: "This bitter piece is not to be construed as a blanket indictment of the Democratic Party or a bid to labor to team up with any other party. Although we have good friends in the Republican Party, the fact remains the bulk of the Democrats have shown a more favorable action and attitude toward the interests of the working man."

Truman is Criticized.

"The unstable wedding of President Truman to the basic principles of his 'fair deal' program was evident to us long before he allowed the boom on the long-suffering railroad worker."

Mr. Truman's jibe at the rail union chiefs was made at a news conference in which he accused the labor leaders of running out on a White House-sponsored agreement designed to end a two-year-old dispute between the unions and the carriers.

Curbs on Newspapers

Shelved in Georgia

By the Associated Press

ATLANTA, Feb. 17.—Georgia's Legislature put two newspaper-curbing bills on ice, passed an all-inclusive 3 per cent sales tax and then adjourned last night.

House Speaker Fred Hand announced yesterday that the newspaper bills sought by Gov. Herman Talmadge would not be brought up during the closing months of the 1951 session.

Mr. Hand gave no reason for the action. The bills will carry over to the January, 1952, session.

The general sales tax applies almost without exception to everybody and all business in the State.

Greatest exemption is that provided for the sale of raw materials to be processed into manufactured goods.

There is no levy either on personal or professional services. Newspaper subscriptions, medicines, foods, clothing, building materials and automobiles are subject to the tax, which becomes effective April 1.

The tax bill was designed to raise \$107 million, but many legislators were of the opinion that it would produce up to \$150 million.

One of the newspaper bills put aside would have made larger newspapers subject to libel suits in any county in which they have 100 subscribers. Under present law suits must be filed in the home county of the newspaper.

The other bill prohibits monopolies and names newspaper monopolies specifically. As drawn, it would affect only the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution, owned by ex-Gov. James Cox of Ohio.

Foreign Policy

(Continued From First Page.)

mittees—Foreign Relations and Armed Services—conducting the joint hearings yesterday afternoon.

The quiet-spoken military leader told the committees "we cannot base our planes and ships on fields and ports that are undefended. The adequate defense of an area—and especially the important area of Europe—will require American divisions."

Although the hearings have another week to run, it already is apparent the Senate will be asked to express its general approval of the administration's decision to send more ground troops to Europe. Such a resolution is expected to emerge from the two committees as a substitute for the Wherry proposal.

The only question likely to confront the 26 Senators on the two committees is whether to write into the resolution some ratio of American to European divisions, or some percentage limitation on the portion of the American Army which should be stationed in Europe to deter Russia.

Staff Limitation Fight.

Senator Taft, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, is leading the fight for a limitation. He is not on either of the committees handling the subject, but would have a chance to make his fight on the Senate floor if no limitation is in the resolution as reported. It is too early to tell how the Senate would line up on a limitation amendment.

In the first two days of testimony Defense Secretary Marshall, Secretary of State Acheson and Gen. Bradley have agreed any limitation would be unwieldy and would tend to offset one of the main purposes of increasing the American garrison overseas—namely, to build up the morale of the other treaty nations and encourage them to increase their own armies.

The revelation that present plans call for sending only four more divisions to join the two already on occupation duty appears to have eased the demand for a limitation, but has not halted the drive.

Senator Douglas of Illinois, one of several Democrats who have been considering some ceiling provision, summed up the situation last night when he said: "Until yesterday I had assumed from published press comment that we were to contribute to this army a total of 10 divisions, or from one-fifth to one-sixth of the total number. I had thought that this proportion was not excessive. But yesterday (Thursday) Secretary Marshall testified . . . it was proposed to send only four additional divisions, making a total of six. This would be from one-eighth to one-tenth of the total ground forces."

"This seems to be a modest enough figure and it weakens, although it does not entirely remove the case for Congress fixing a rough ratio of our troops to those of the others."

Bradley Highlights.

Highlights of Gen. Bradley's testimony were:

The two American divisions already in Europe would be in danger in the event of war, unless reinforced, whereas six could take care of themselves, with sea and air support.

If war comes, the general said, he would rather be in a position to fly American planes against the enemy from North Africa, France and Norway than from Florida, Michigan and Massachusetts.

It has been made clear to the North Atlantic treaty nations that the rate at which American troops move to Europe will depend on the effort the Europeans make in their own behalf.

Secretary Acheson testified the other treaty nations are expected to double their combat forces in the next year.

This brought from Senator Wherry today the comment, "Even if they double their forces, what have you got? How would it compare with what Russia has?"

Senator Wherry expressed resentment at Senator Connally's criticism of him for being out of Washington making speeches Thursday when the hearings opened. Senator Connally's remark was made when another Republican Senator tried to submit a list of written questions.

U. S. Should Take Lead

In Western Unity, Says Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.

By the Associated Press

The United States should take the lead in promoting closer union among the peoples of the Western world, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., the movie actor, said last night.

Mr. Fairbanks told the Washington Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee, in Cardozo High School, that such a step would provide the Western peoples with a "vested interest in freedom."

He emphasized that "circumstances oblige us, however reluctantly, to recognize that only by unity with Western Europe can we achieve the necessary balance of power to restrain the Soviet combination."

He said it can be seen how Russia identifies itself and its cause with the international working man.

"We must somehow identify our fate with the fate of others," Mr. Fairbanks declared. "It is our own lack of emphasis on such motives for policy that affords the Marxist slogan a widely receptive audience. Surely, the theory of Western European Union makes sense."

He said he didn't feel that any attempt on the part of the democracies to find some system of common government would interfere with current efforts to meet the present emergency. "In no wise do I see it as a substitute for existing diplomatic machinery," Mr. Fairbanks added. "It would merely investigate the possibility of finding a stronger 'situation of strength' in federation by law instead of alliance."

Richard F. Harless, former Democratic representative from Arizona, was chairman of the meeting. He is director of the Washington office of the Atlantic Union Committee.

VA Promises to Help

Baltimore Institute

By the Associated Press

BALTIMORE, Feb. 17.—If the Baltimore Construction Institute reopens, the Veterans' Administration will try to keep it going with some payments.

Otherwise, the VA will try to place the institution's ex-GI students in other schools.

That was the word given yesterday to a delegation of students from the institute. It had been closed after the VA suspended payments on grounds that it had overcharged the Government about \$287,000 since 1947 for training for a serviceman under the GI Bill of Rights.

Charles Wendt, school director, denied that the institute ever had billed the VA for anything outside its contract.

The closing of the school resulted in mass protests and demonstrations by some 300 students Thursday.

"Yesterday they sent a delegation to Washington to a meeting with H. V. Sterlin, assistant administrator for the VA national rehabilitation and education division. He told them the law does not provide for subsistence payments while the school is closed."

Wholesale Prices Up

14th Straight Week

By the Associated Press

Wholesale prices rose again during the week ending February 13 despite price controls. It was the 14th straight week in which the prices have advanced to new peaks.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, reporting this yesterday, said its index of wholesale prices went up 0.5 per cent, putting it 2.6 per cent above a month earlier and 16.8 per cent higher than the level just prior to the outbreak of the Korean war.

The index on February 13 stood at 183.3 per cent of 1926 prices, which are regarded as normal.

From Senator Wherry to be answered by Gen. Marshall. The questions were held in abeyance. Senator Wherry is not a member of either of the committees, and he said it was known to committee staff members before he left the city that he would not be heard until next Tuesday.

Russian Press, Radio

Echo Stalin's Latest

Blast Against U. N.

By the Associated Press

MOSCOW, Feb. 17.—Prime Minister Stalin's latest broadcast against the United Nations, which he termed a tool of "American aggression," was on every front page in the Soviet Union today.

Repeated broadcasts on the Soviet radio echoed the Kremlin leader's pronouncement—his most important in two years—to the one-sixth of the world which is the U. S. S. R. and beyond.

Stalin, in a lengthy interview with Pravda last night, branded as "shameful" the United Nations resolution labeling Communist China as aggressor in Korea.

He also declared: "If Britain and the United States reject finally the proposals made by the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can only end in a defeat of the interventionists."

War Still Not Inevitable.

Do you consider a new world war inevitable? Stalin was asked. The Kremlin leader replied:

"No. At least at the present time, it cannot be considered inevitable."

Diplomats here and in world capitals studied carefully the latest authoritative statement from the head of the Soviet government looking for keys to future Soviet policy.

Western envoys in Moscow interpreted his views on the Korean war as highly significant. It was regarded as indicating the door is not yet closed to a peaceful settlement between the U. N. and the Peiping government.

Mostly, however, they regarded Stalin's carefully worded pronouncement as a reaffirmation of what lesser Soviet spokesmen have been saying in the past few months.

In his first major foreign-policy statement in two years the 71-year-old Soviet leader denounced the United Nations resolution labeling Communist China an aggressor as "disgraceful" and predicted the U. N.'s downfall. He declared:

"The United Nations organization is therefore taking the inglorious road of the League of Nations. In this way it is burying its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration."

Stalin charged that the U. N. was not proportionally representative of world populations and had become "not as much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, an organization acting on behalf of the requirements of the American aggressors."

He said American GIs fought brilliantly and effectively in defeating Germany and Japan, but that they were losing on Korean battlefields because they had no faith in their cause.

The broadcast from the Kremlin was in direct reply to a recent House of Commons statement by British Prime Minister Attlee to the effect that after the end of World War II the Soviet Union did not disarm. Stalin castigated the statement as "a slander against the Soviet Union."

The Soviet Prime Minister's last major announcement on foreign affairs came in a question-and-answer interview with Kingsbury Smith of the International News Service early in 1949. A hint thrown out in that interview and seized upon by American diplomats, resulted in a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers and an end of the Berlin blockade.

Conviction of Brenke

In Morals Case Upheld

By the Associated Press

The Municipal Court of Appeals yesterday rejected a former Government employee's contention that his conviction on a morals charge should be set aside because the only witness against him was the arresting officer.

The court unanimously upheld the October 2 conviction of Donald B. Brenke, 26, on a charge with some payments.

Otherwise, the VA will try to place the institution's ex-GI students in other schools.

That was the word given yesterday to a delegation of students from the institute. It had been closed after the VA suspended payments on grounds that it had overcharged the Government about \$287,000 since 1947 for training for a serviceman under the GI Bill of Rights.

Charles Wendt, school director, denied that the institute ever had billed the VA for anything outside its contract.

The closing of the school resulted in mass protests and demonstrations by some 300 students Thursday.

"Yesterday they sent a delegation to Washington to a meeting with H. V. Sterlin, assistant administrator for the VA national rehabilitation and education division. He told them the law does not provide for subsistence payments while the school is closed."

Wholesale Prices Up

14th Straight Week

By the Associated Press

Wholesale prices rose again during the week ending February 13 despite price controls. It was the 14th straight week in which the prices have advanced to new peaks.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, reporting this yesterday, said its index of wholesale prices went up 0.5 per cent, putting it 2.6 per cent above a month earlier and 16.8 per cent higher than the level just prior to the outbreak of the Korean war.

The index on February 13 stood at 183.3 per cent of 1926 prices, which are regarded as normal.

From Senator Wherry to be answered by Gen. Marshall. The questions were held in abeyance. Senator Wherry is not a member of either of the committees, and he said it was known to committee staff members before he left the city that he would not be heard until next Tuesday.

United Artists Control

Passes to Krim Group

By the Associated Press

NEW YORK, Feb. 17.—Control of United Artists' Corp., major motion picture distributing concern, yesterday passed from a group headed by Paul V. McNutt to one headed by Arthur B. Krim, long prominent in the theatrical and movie field.

The transaction was announced in a joint statement by Attorney Lloyd Wright and by Mr. McNutt, who had acquired control only five months ago from Marx Pickford and Charles Chaplin, co-owners of the firm.

The announcement said the Chicago firm of Walter E. Heller & Co. is providing ample working capital and funds for new production.

Text of Stalin's Charges Against U. N.

By the Associated Press

LONDON, Feb. 17.—The text of an interview with Soviet Prime Minister Stalin by a Pravda correspondent as broadcast last night by the Moscow radio and heard here:

Q. How do you estimate the latest statement made by British Prime Minister Attlee in the House of Commons to the effect that after the termination of the war the Soviet Union did not disarm, i.e., did not demobilize its troops and that since then the Soviet Union is constantly increasing its armed forces?

A. I estimate this statement made by Prime Minister Attlee as a slander against the Soviet Union. It is known to the whole world that the Soviet Union demobilized its troops after the war.

Three Stages Cited.

As is known, demobilization was carried out in three stages:

The first and second stages, in the course of the year 1945; the third stage, from May to September, 1946. In addition, the demobilization of older age groups of the personnel of the Soviet Army was carried out in 1946 and 1947.

Such are the facts known to everyone.

If Prime Minister Attlee were competent in financial or economic science, he would have realized without difficulty that not a single state, the Soviet Union included, could develop civilian industry to the full, launch great construction projects like the hydroelectric power stations on the volga and Dnieper and the Amu Darya (Oxus), which demand scores of thousands of millions of budget expenditure; continue the policy of systematic price reduction for consumer goods, which also demands scores of thousands of millions in budget expenditure; invest hundreds of thousands of millions in the restoration of the national economy destroyed by the German invaders, and together simultaneously with this multiply its armed forces and develop its industry.

Peril of Bankruptcy.

It is not difficult to understand that so reckless a policy would have led any state to bankruptcy.

Prime Minister Attlee should have known by his own experience as well as by the experience of the United States that the multiplication of a country's armed forces and an arms race lead to developing war industry, to curtailing civilian construction work, to increased taxation, to a rise in prices for consumer goods.

It starts to reason that if the Soviet Union is not reducing but on the contrary is expanding its civilian industry, it is not winding up but on the contrary expanding the construction of new civilian hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems; is not stopping but on the contrary continuing the policy of price reduction. It cannot simultaneously with this inflate war industry and multiply its armed forces without risking finding itself in a state of bankruptcy.

If despite all these facts and scientific considerations, Prime Minister Attlee considers it nevertheless possible openly to slander the Soviet Union and its peaceful policy, this can only be explained by the fact that by slandering the Soviet Union he thinks it is possible to justify the armaments race in Britain now being carried out by the Labor Government.

Says "Lie" Is Needed.

Prime Minister Attlee needs a lie against the Soviet Union, and it is essential to him to depict the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union as an aggressive one and the aggressive policy of the British Government as a peaceful one in order to mislead the British people, to impose upon them that lie about the U. S. S. R. and thus to draw them by means of deceit into the new war now being organized by the ruling circles of the United States.

Prime Minister Attlee represents himself to be a supporter of peace. However, if he is really in favor of peace, why did he reject the proposal of the Soviet Union in the United Nations organization for the immediate conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States of America, China and France?

If he truly stands for peace, why did he reject the proposals of the Soviet Union for an immediate start on the reduction of armaments, for the immediate prohibition of atomic weapons?

If he is really in favor of peace, why does he persecute the fighting peace, why did he prohibit the Peace Congress in Britain?

Can a campaign in defense of peace threaten Britain's security?

Charges Aggressive Policy.

It is obvious that Prime Minister Attlee is not in favor of preserving peace, but of unleashing a new aggressive world war.

What do you think of the intervention in Korea? How could it end?

A. If Britain and the United States reject finally the proposals made by the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can only end in a defeat of the interventionists.

Q. Is it possible that the American and British generals and officers are worse than the Chinese generals and officers?

A. No. They are not worse. American and British generals and officers are in no way worse than the generals and officers of any other country.

As to the soldiers of the United States and Britain, as is known, they showed themselves in the best light in the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan. Wherein lies the crux of the matter? It lies in the fact that the soldiers regard the war against Korea and China as unjust, whereas they regarded the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan as completely just.

Calls Korean War Unpopular.

The matter at issue is that this war is extremely unpopular among the American and British soldiers. Indeed, it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, which is not threatening either Britain or the United States, and from which

the Americans appropriated the island of Taiwan (Formosa), is the aggressor, whereas the United States, which appropriated the island of Taiwan and brought its troops to the very boundaries of China, is the party defending itself.

It is difficult to convince the soldiers that the United States is entitled to defend its security on the territory of Korea and at the frontiers of China, whereas China and Korea have no right to defend their security on their own territory or at the frontiers of their states. This is the reason why the war is unpopular among the Anglo-American soldiers.

It stands to reason that the most experienced generals and officers can suffer defeat if the soldiers regard the war imposed upon them as profoundly unjust and if, as a result of this, they perform their duties on the front in a formal way without faith in the righteousness of their mission and without enthusiasm.

Q. How do you estimate the decision of the United Nations organization which proclaimed the Chinese People's Republic an aggressor?

A. I estimate it as a shameful decision. Indeed, one must lose the last vestiges of conscience to contend that the United States, which appropriated Chinese territory—the island of Taiwan—and which invaded Korea close to the frontiers of China, is the party defending itself, whereas the Chinese People's Republic, which is defending its frontiers and is striving to secure the return of the island of Taiwan appropriated by the Americans, is the aggressor.

Sees U. N. Tool of War.

The United Nations Organization, created as the bulwark for preserving peace, is being turned into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war.

The aggressive core of the United Nations is represented by the 10 member countries of the aggressive North Atlantic pact (the United States, Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway and Iceland) and the Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela).

The representatives of these countries now decide the fate of war and peace in the United Nations. It was they who carried in the United Nations the shameful decision on the aggressiveness of the Chinese People's Republic. It is characteristic of the present-day regime in the United Nations that, for instance, the small Dominican Republic in America, whose population hardly amounts to two million, has the same weight in the United Nations as India and much more weight than the Chinese People's Republic, which is deprived of the right to vote in the United Nations.

Thus, being turned into the tool of aggressive war, the United Nations organization is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of nations enjoying equal rights.

Calls U. N. Puppet of U. S.

As a matter of fact, the United Nations organization is now not so much a world organization as an

organization for the Americans. An organization acting on behalf of the requirements of the American aggressors.

Not only the United States and Canada are striving to unleash a new war. The same stand has also been taken by 20 Latin American countries, the landowners and businessmen of which are craving for a new war somewhere in Europe or Asia in order to sell goods to the belligerent countries for excessively high prices and to earn millions from that sanguinary business.

It is not a secret for any one that 20 representatives of 20 Latin American countries now represent the most solid and obedient army of the United States of America in the United Nations organization.

The United Nations organization is therefore taking the inglorious road of the League of Nations. In this way it is burying its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration.

Q. Do you consider a new world war inevitable?

A. No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.

Charges "Thirst" for War.

Of course, in the United States of America, in Britain, as also in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain super-profits, to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires who regard war as an item of income which gives colossal profits. They these aggressive forces, control the reactionary governments and direct them.

But at the same time they are afraid of their peoples who do not want a new war and stand for the maintenance of peace. Therefore they are trying to use the reactionary governments in order to enmesh their peoples with lies, to deceive them and to depict the new war as defensive and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as aggressive. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a new war.

Precisely for this reason they are afraid of the campaign in defense of peace, fearing that it can expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments. Precisely for this reason they turned down the proposal of the Soviet Government for the conclusion of a peace pact, for the reduction of armaments, for banning the atomic weapon, fearing that the adoption of these proposals would undermine the aggressive measure of the reactionary governments and make the armaments race unnecessary.

What will be the end of this struggle of the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of first-rate importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue a policy of averting war and maintaining peace.

Stalin

(Continued From First Page.)

be a prelude to a Russian withdrawal from that body, or whether it was just some more Soviet abuse. Most diplomats were inclined to the latter view.